REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated August 23, 2005, having a shortened statutory period set to expire November 23, 2005 Claims 1, 5-8, 12-15, and 19-29 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 12-15, and 19-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,962,452, issued to Nogami et al. (hereinafter *Nogami*) and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,438,566, issued to Okuno et al. (hereinafter *Okuno*). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Applicants' claimed invention differs in operation and structure from the method and system disclosed by *Nogami*. As explained and depicted throughout Applicants' specification and figures, Applicants' proposed invention is directed to facilitating human review of computer program comment line translation. Applicants' proposed method for achieving enhanced comment translation review includes parsing out and isolating the comments from the code (the instruction portions), translating the comments, and combining the isolated comments with the translations of the isolated comments to provide a condensed forum for efficient review of the comment line translations.

Nogami's system does not disclose or suggest any procedure or device for effectuating any such extraction and isolation of comments for condensed review. As explained at col. 1, lines 37-57, col. 6, lines 32-55, col. 7, lines 15-20, and elsewhere, *Nogami* explains that the invention is directed to translating a given language to another language, which includes recognizing and properly processing various structures, particularly inline comments included as part of the original language syntax. Generally, *Nogami's* method includes steps of recognizing a comment, extracting the comment for translation in accordance with a specialized comment dictionary, translating the non-comment portion of the text in accordance with another dictionary, and finally reinserting the translated comment into the rest of the translated text.

Regarding the grounds for rejecting claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicants disagree with the assertion on page 3 of the Office Action that a step of "combining each of the one or more translated text items and each of the one or more comment text items within a combined text data

structure" is disclosed at col. 6, line 37- col. 7, line 35; Abstract, lines 10-15. Col. 6, line 37 – col. 7, line 35 describes the translation process depicted in FIG. 6 in which a comment in the original language is recognized, extracted, analyzed and translated in accordance with a first dictionary and re-combined with the non-comment text (which has been translated in accordance with a second dictionary) to form a full translation of comment and non-comment text. The Abstract describes the same process in more generally terms. Furthermore, Applicants disagree that a data structure including a combination of untranslated and translated comment items is inherent from the foregoing passages.

Applicants note, however, that FIG. 3, and the related description at col. 3, lines 45-53, may arguably disclose the foregoing claim element since the translated document is displayed on different sides of the same display. In the preliminary amendment filed in associated with the request for continued examination filed on June 28, 2005, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to more expressly distinguish the nature of Applicants' combining step and the combination document shown in FIG. 3 of *Nogami*. Namely, the foregoing combining step was amended to recite "… a comment text data structure in which the copied comment text items are isolated from the program code items" and "combining each of the one or more translated text items and each of the one or more comment text items from the comment text data structure within a combined text data structure." As amply explained in the remarks accompanying the preliminary amendment, the significance of this amendment is not that a separate comment data text structure is used per se, but that the comment isolation feature of the second "comment text data structure" element is unambiguously incorporated into the combining step. Namely, the express language of the second and fourth elements of claim 1 requires that the isolated comments are combined with the translations of the isolated comments in the combined text data structure. The result, as depicted in FIG. 2 (combined text data structure 146) and described at page 9, line 15 through page 10, line 21 specification is a combined text data structure in which the comments isolated from the program code in comment text data structure 142 are combined with the translated comments in translated text data structure 144 to provide a condensed comment-only document enabling much more efficient comment translation review.

Applicants do not traverse that *Okuno* may disclose a data structure that stores comments. However, neither *Nogami* nor *Okuno*, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests

an equivalent to Applicants' recited "combined text data structure" that combines comments received from a comment isolation source (e.g. comment data structure 142) and translations of the isolated comments. Applicants therefore believe the foregoing rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at (512) 343-6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew W. Baca
Reg. No. 42,277
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
Telephone (512) 343-6116
Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS